

I. A Study of Colonial Discourse in Soyinka's *The Lion and The Jewel* and Coetzee's *Youth*

This research examines the exploration of in between space and ambivalence conditions of the native people. The deep study of Soyinka and Coetzee's works will enable to analyze the political, social and economic effects of colonialism to the non-European countries. Through the colonial discourse, the colonial power gradually built up administrative systems based on European systems of government. Gradually, many colonial people were influenced by European ideas. Colonialism changed the way of life of colonized people. Third World people went to live in European and they learnt new skill and crafts. They received education prepared by the colonial powers and they internalized the European ideas and thought. But they are unhappy because they are externally as well as internally suppressed by the colonizer's attitudes.

This constant crossing has generated awareness that within hybridity the language-games or concepts of postcolonialism may irresolvably come into conflict. When someone nurtured in one culture is placed in another, she/he may face cultural dislocation and ambivalence and the resultant reactions may be anger, frustration, fear, curiosity, fascination, repulsion, hatred or confusion. Identity results in crisis when location of the culture is not in the specific time space and culture. Homi K Bhabha finds positing one self in one location or image problematic since the posited subject "finds or recognizes itself through an image which is simultaneously alienating and hence potentially confrontational" (Mongia 46).

Wole Soyinka a playwright, novelist, critic lecturer, teacher, actor, translator, politician, and publisher, is the first African to win the Nobel Prize in literature. Most of his plays offered a critique of pre-colonial history while diminishing the cultural

significance of the colonial period; “Soyinka’s drama has been an investigation of the political, religious, and other forces in Nigerian culture” (1175). He also satirizes pre-colonial African regimes by verbal inventiveness; “*A Dance of the Forests* was written to celebrate Nigerian independence” (1175). Most of his plays are based on the beliefs of his Yoruba background; “*The Swamp Dwellers* is a powerful play condemning African superstition” (1175). He uses Yoruba songs translated into English and adopts old rituals that criticize violence and corruption in the society; “*The Lion and the Jewel* offers a comic view of Nigerian attitudes towards European values left over from the colonial period” (1175). Soyinka emphasizes the importance of new moral consciousness. His political sympathies led to a term in prison where he was placed in solitary confinement; “Soyinka’s play *Death and the King’s Horseman* reworks a moment in Nigeria’s colonial past from inside the Yoruba metaphysic” (1175). Wole Soyinka presents the protagonist, Lakunle to show the ambivalent relation between the colonizers and colonized because he mimics the western civilization as Bhabha says; “mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal, mimicry is thus, the sign of double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline which “appropriates” the other as it visualizes power” (86).

Similarly, J.M. Coetzee was born in 1940, the son of mixed Afrikaner and German parentage. He is the winner of Nobel Prize for literature in 2003. People claim that he was long felt like an exile in his own land. Lynn Meskell and Lindsay Weiss, the modern critics, deliver their views on Coetzee and his writings as: “J.M. Coetzee has consistently engaged with the politics of the past, particularly the contemporary ethical ramifications of the colonial past, alongside the more recent and bitter history of oppression under apartheid” (88). J.M Coetzee writes about the

human condition generally, giving us all pause to reflect on especially prosaic and personal identity in which colonial rule comes to have meaning for individuals. He explores the political subjectivity that underscores all information discussed at school and the community and also finds the issues of race and jurisdiction in Coetzee's writings: "Coetzee destroys the apparently moral foundation of our discourses: the protection of animals or liberalism, for example, or enlightened tolerance with regard to question of race or jurisdiction, guilt and atonement" (Leusmann 60).

Youth is a novel about an individual and we can also compare the protagonist, John with the author's life. Margaret Lenta also observes the autobiographical traces in *Youth* (158). The ending of this novel proves that the colonial mentality of the protagonist brings despair in his life. Margaret Lenta says that the protagonist has problematic relationship with his country and his parents (162). It is the problem created by the colonial mentality of the protagonist. That colonial mentality is the construction of western discourse about life and art. Lynn Meskee and Linday Weiss consider about this matter as: "Coetzee's allegory epitomizes the Foucauldian dynamic of power" (92). Like Soyinka, Coetzee presents the post- colonial situation and brings a view of an obsessed life that is the cause of the colonial mentality.

African writers should be devoted in social change through protest writing by exploring the deep African culture and history. Some critics have studied these novels as the tragedy of protagonists John and Lakunke in terms of assimilation of change in the society:

The hegemonic culture holds a power fluctuation for subordinate groups eager to gain social acceptance or recognition and thus to terminate discrimination. Where such acceptance is pursued

deliberately and with some promise of success we are in the presence of acculturation through upward mobility. (Dallmayr 17)

John and Lakunke define their home exactly. They are still in search and construction of homeland. Cultural conflict causes changes not only in social, cultural or economical status of an individual, but also places in one's consciousness. We understand the causes that happen due to cultural ambivalence when we read the joining together of several cognitive realm, languages, and worldviews in the written text.

That experiences of ambivalence differ is one of the crucial distinctions to be made in any discussion of the subject. The inbetween space creates homeland because a physical return was virtually impossible, an emotional or spiritual renewal was an ongoing necessity. They are always after the emotional or the spiritual renewal of their self. With these words, they initiate the discussion of the cultural ambivalence in his novel. The contact between aboriginals of the colonized and the colonizers had multifaceted impact on the land and culture of the native people. Colonial society emerges a binary relationship between the people of two cultures, races and languages and such relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society.

Most of the problems that John and Lakunke encounter are the result of the postcolonial condition of the ambivalence. In terms of cultural identity there is nothing absolutely new in the world. Both texts celebrate hybridity, impurity, intermingling, transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings cultures, ideas, and politics. This is their definition of hybrid; one they embrace in his novels. The texts effectively distribute the narrative voice and elements among several secondary characters that usurp the main story line and provide different reading and interpretations of the events. *The Lion and Jewel* and

Youth are the exercise in European postmodernity by a hybrid metropolitan intellectual who fail to show how deeply rooted it is in cultural and religious traditions. They have generated a huge amount of criticism that debates and explores the relationships between Christianity and Yoruba tradition. That is to say, competing definitions of the literary generated by this publications have also depended upon, and predicated, competing definitions of the real. Another reading of the incident would see it as a more straightforward fantastic strategy employed as a metaphor of the postcolonial condition.

The characters are not presented to the reader; they are rather thrown into the fictional world of the novel. This hyperbolic nature of the postcolonial is what the abrupt entrance of the postcolonial subjects into the imperial center. The tense situation of ambivalence is only metaphors of the postcolonial situation. The list includes: language, familiar surroundings, customs, social position, and security. These things have either been lost entirely, or radically transformed; the process in the novels that describe this transformation is 'translation'. As Homi Bhabha argues that the culture of the 'in-between', the minority position, dramatizes the activity of culture's untranslatability; and in so doing, it moves the question of culture's appropriation belong the assimilationist's dream (9). Bhabha argues that each time the culture undergoes an attempted 'translation', the untranslatable element or cultural marker of existence and identity remains beyond assimilation, or beyond the fantasy of complete reproduction. In other words, the 'appropriation' of culture always breaks down as the appropriative gesture moves towards becoming 'an encounter with the ambivalent process of splitting and hybridity that marks the identification with culture's differences.

John and Lakunke are suffered from cultural difference that becomes a problem that have described as the irresolution, the subject of resistance in the process of transformation. This space of translation of cultural difference at the interstices is infused with temporality of the present that makes a moment of transition. John and Lakunke's cultures are dominated by the western cultures. The descendants of their ambivalent movements generated by colonialism have developed their own distinctive cultures, which both preserve and often extend and develop their original culture. Their adaptations of cultural identity are the positive affirmation of his hybridity.

Soyinka and Coetzee provoke discussions about the status of the literary than perhaps any other work of our time. The polemical debates that ensued over forced many people – readers and writers of all kinds – to reflect seriously about the effects and scope of literature, its responsibility and freedom. Ambivalence is a term developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and achieving its opposite. Ambivalence is an important feature of colonial discourse that dependent on the concept of fluctuation in the ideological construction. Lakunle, the protagonist of *The Lion and the Jewel* does not only embrace the western thought but also endeavors to upgrade the Yoruba tradition at the same time. Consequently, Lakunle faces the cultural conflict and fails to marry Sidi, a village belle to whom he loves much and meets a tragic end. Bhabha concept of ambivalence is related to the characterization of Lakunle who tries to be a westerner; but neither he can totally adopt the Western civilization nor he can avoid the Yoruba tradition. Lakunle neither totally adopt Western thought nor totally avoid his own Yoruba tradition. The tragic end of the Lakunle is because of cultural dualism or hybridity which is the leftover of colonialism in Nigeria.

Therefore, the tension remains between their desire for western culture and unavoidable situation for the Yoruba tradition. As a result, both Lakunle and John neither can fully avoid the western influence nor can he fully escape away from the culture of origin so that he faces the situation of “a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposites” (Ashcroft et al 12). John and Lakunle also fall in the same situation since they fails to assimilate between two traditions; adopting the Western thought and marrying with the native girl Sidi. The play makes clear antithesis between the western modernization and the tradition by offering a comic view of Nigerian attitudes toward European values because it is not his modern thoughts that reject the bride- price but his rejection of traditional customs has a strong economic cause; he simply cannot afford.

John and Lakunle follow the culture of colonizer so that they are caught up in a state of “neither the one nor the other” (Bhabha 219) and they lie in its concealment of same real identity behind its mask that comes from its double vision that are disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse. Soyinka and Coetzee face the same situation; increasing aware of the pull between African tradition and Western modernization. Furthermore, Soyinka in his *Myth, Literature and African World* illustrates the tension between two western and native cultures: “the Greek religion shows persuasive parallels with, to stick to our example, the Yoruba is no means denied” (14). Thus, the tension remains not only in the character but also in the writer and his tradition.

John and Lakunle feel the crisis of identity and the crisis of identity is felt when the culture is cut across and when it intersects natural frontiers and when people have been dispersed forever or temporarily from their homelands. When a person feels alienated she/he remains deep-rooted in her or his psychology and always fails

to link oneself with the metropolis. The hybrid modality also challenge the assumption of the pure and the authentic concepts upon which the resistance to often stands. (*Post Colonial Reader* 9). Overall it is general problematic feeling of loss of original language, land and other cultural belongings for each individual. Migration is the ongoing process that is essential and defining characteristics of mankind; from the day the first humans left East Africa to populate the world. It is either forceful or intentional movement from the place of origin to the unwanted or strange places. It can both be temporary or permanent. These days it has become a political issue because it challenges and questions the identity of the migrants as language, nation and after all culture is different in the host country.

They avoid the traditional good and evil dichotomy with his characters; instead they are roles, phases of a whole being. Cultural ambivalence caught between east and west is an extremely important topic in their fictions and play a decisive role in shaping out the intricacies of the plot. Once again the figure of the author contaminates the text because they also happens to be in the same place as his characters: he is also a stranger in a strange land and perhaps the prototype for his fictional creatures. They have made it a determining feature of counter hegemonic literature and politics. Coetzee and Soyinka are not alone in being fascinated by the liberator and metaphysical connotations that attach themselves to the concept. Cultural ambivalence refers not an only to the displacements of people in history but to a state of displacement that be falls humankind in general.

This research analyzes how the characters have expressed their colonial mentality, as the western culture and literary tradition are superior to the non-western. The colonial mentality of the characters is the prime focus of the study. Soyinka and Coetzee capture the picture of African youth who tries to escape his own native land

and moves to Europe. Through the protagonists, John and Lakunke, we can observe how such colonial discourses encourage the westerners to colonize the African people. The protagonist of *Youth* is searching for a method of communicating his ideas and feeling in western literary tradition. English literature, which is a vehicle for western imperial ideas, kills the native sensibilities of John, the protagonist of *Youth*. In this novel, the English literary tradition functioned as a legitimate colonizer in the highest and the most perfect state. This western literary tradition is, at the same time, the embodiment of universal human value: "T.S. Eliot worked for a bank. Wallace Stevens and Franz Kafka worked for insurance companies. In their unique ways, Eliot and Stevens and Kafka suffered no less than Poe or Rimbaud. There is no dishonor in electing to follow Eliot and Stevens and Kafka" (60).

Ambivalence is enabling the literary text to enter the political sphere. To put this yet another way, the questions concerning in relation to fiction/the real are recast by the novel precisely via its 'ambivalence of form', and it is the ongoing state of 'ambivalence' that allows the text to intervene in the political.

John and Lakunke believed that the Europe is a land of charm, attraction and full of opportunities and they marginalize their native land and people. The novel *Youth* is centered on the colonial mentality among the African youth because they try to internalize the white ideologies in the form of politics, identity, culture, language and literary traditions. They accept the Euro-centric belief of the westerners that white as superior and others as the inferior. The development of cultures necessarily questions essentialist models, interrogating the ideology underpins of unified, natural cultural norm, and one that undermines the centre/margin model of colonialist discourse. Crucially, this statement is followed by a summary of John and Lakunke's own undesirable space of existence, as the certainties in his life slip away. In this

mode of writing, they should be viewed as the chronically of the unfettered migrant sensibility, that version of postcolonialism that unhooks historical tradition from place, and that creates new, self-conscious kinds of identity from a fragmentary vision.

The highly creative sensibility is one that goes beyond binary thinking and the straightforward 'clash of cultures' thesis that often lies behind oppositional readings of these novels. Bhabha says colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalence because it suggests that resistance exist in fluctuating relation within the colonial subject that characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject (*Key* 13). This obscures the anxiety of the irresolvable, borderline culture of hybridity that articulates its problems of identification and its ambivalent position in an uncanny, disjunctive temporality that is, as once the time of cultural displacement, and the space of the untranslatable.

The conflict of cultures and community has been mainly represented in spatial terms and binary geopolitical polarities. Lakunle living in inbetween is constantly trying to make an attempt to identify themselves with their home through the help of memories of the forsaken land as well through the hope of restoration and unification with the home. The protagonist cannot go against his own tradition though he is attracted by the colonizer's culture, "not with fingers but with knives/ and forks, and breakable plates/ like civilized beings". Lakunle's mimicry is always potentially disestablishing to colonial discourse and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of colonial dominance: "I kissed you as all educated men/ And Christians – kiss their wives/ It is the way of civilized romance" (*Collected Plays* 10). Here Lakunle shows his colonial mentality that assumes the west is the source of everything. Although he judges his native peoples, their culture

and religion, he cannot avoid the influence of his own roots. Due to cultural conflict migration and globalization, their identities become hybrid as they assimilate themselves with different cultures. Such cultural hybridities is the consequence of the Orientalist projection of the west that results the 'ambivalent relationship' between colonizers and the colonized. With the process of decolonization, the newly independent identity is tried to make an effort to negate the cultural effects of colonization. John and Lakunke are felt essential to be free of biased Eurocentric images and try to create individual identity.

John and Lakunke's stories are the result of his inability to transcend the gap between cultures and inhabit this space as a hybrid. Since they are not attached to any culture, they keep bouncing between rejections, disassociated and uprooted. Mulder's approach sees migration from new angle. According to his approach, "Individual preference, resources, and constraints influence the extent to which certain events and circumstances in parallel career lead to migration" (qtd in Ainsaar 72). Ambivalence is the ongoing process, which is defining characteristics of mankind; from the day the first humans left East Africa to populate the world. It is either forceful or intentional movement from the place of origin to the unwanted or strange places. It can both be temporary or permanent. These days it has become a political issue because it challenges and questions the identity as language, nation and after all culture is different in the host country.

II. The Concept of Ambivalence in Hybrid Situation

Ambivalence that causes cultural conflict has its influence on social, cultural and economic status of an individual. It also affects one's level of consciousness. Ambivalence caught between east and west is an extremely important topic. Such cultural hybridity is the consequence of Orientalist projection of the west that results 'ambivalent relationship' between the colonizers and the colonized. Wole Soyinka and J. M. Coetzee started writing and publishing stories that drafted about the Nigerian encounter with colonialism seen through the lives of three generations within the same family. "I might argue that postcolonial negotiations are 'space' that are conveniently not of the centre nor of the other, an orphaned surplus of hybridity for which anyone might speak. Such 'spaces' are produced in the politics of colonialism and post colonialism" (Jacobs 8). This research explores inbetween space and ambivalence of the characters that portrays a stunning moment in African history – the imposition of colonial rule – with sympathy and dignity, focusing on the complexity and integrity of precolonial life and turmoil resulting from British rule.

When someone nurtured in one culture is placed to another culture, she/he may face cultural dislocation and ambivalence. The resultant reactions may be anger, frustration, fear, curiosity, fascination, repulsion, hatred and confusion: "I cannot possibly claim anti colonial politics and, what is more, might simply work to embellish the 'core'. I might involve in a postcolonial notion of some 'inbetween space' as a way of legitimating my transgression" (Jacobs 8). The result of their inability to transcend the gap between cultures and inhabit this space as a hybrid. Ambivalence, which defines the characteristics of particular character, is an ongoing process. It is either forceful or intentional movement to the unwanted or strange places from the place of its origin. It can be temporary or permanent either. It has now

become a political as well as cultural issues that raises the questions of identity of language, nation and culture. Culture shapes human behavior. It helps people to guide their action. It surprisingly gives an individual to his/her identity. Moreover, transformation of culture leads to identity crisis in the life of an individual, as he/she could not assimilate the new culture.

Imperial discourse should be ambivalent for the purpose of resistance. Even after the political independence, the once colonized nations or states were 'colonized' again with English language as their first language; Bible as their Holy Scripture and Christmas as their religious festival. Postcolonialism is related to nationalism. Based on the premises that hybridity emerges from the cross breeding of two species and things: "The *ozo* title lost its appeal in the twentieth century when colonial officers stripped traditional Igbo chiefs of their power and then subordinated them to British-appointed warrant chiefs and western-educated Africans" (Oehadike xxvii). The modern move to position hybridity as a disruptive democratic discourse of cultural citizenship is distinctly anti-imperialist and antiauthoritarian development.

The colonial discourse, because of its domination and control in relation to the culture of the colonized people, leads people of colonized country to ambivalent condition. The mimicry of European learning is being hybridized. Identity results in crisis when location of culture is not in specific of time, space and culture. Homi K. Bhabha finds oneself in one location or image 'problematic' since the posited subject "finds or recognizes itself through an image which is simultaneously alienating and hence, potentially confrontational" (Mongia 46). It is outcome of hybridization. Hybridity draws on local and transnational identification and it generates historically new mediations. Hybridity is one of the most widely employed and most disputed

terms in the postcolonial theory. It commonly refers to creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zones produced by the colonization.

Cultural dualism is a continuous process characterized by the fusion and adjustment of various cultural traits. It facilitates partial adaptation and final assimilation. Partial adaptation, in any case, involves a greater subtlety in self-other relation. Rather than self-imposition of hegemonic situation, selective borrowing requires a willingness to recognize the distinctness of other culture, coupled with a desire to maintain at least some indigenous preferences. So, it is a multicultural and multinational space, which could be called the global culture. This space, which is neither the one nor the other, 'inbetween', provides a terrain for postcolonial hybrid writers to define their own selves discriminated back upon the eyes of power. Hybridity lies between two edges i.e. between the pure and the impure; and between past and present since it inherently encompasses opposite categories.

The antecedent for this discourse falls in complex negotiation between colonial's objectless and modernity's new historic subjects i.e. the colonizers and the colonized. Ambivalence has simultaneous impacts of exploitative and nurturing to recognize the stereotype as an ambivalent mode of knowledge. Power demands a theoretical and political response that challenges the deterministic or functionalist modes of conceiving the relationship between discourse and politics. The most pervasively inferred consequences of cultural hybridity are the sense of alienation, isolation, rootlessness and displacement. While such ideas are translated into literary writings, the underlying motif always remains demand for cultural root and reconciliation with the uncontaminated form of the cultural past. Jacobs further quotes Bhabha: "While Bhabha's notion of mimicry proposes a colonial absorption of agency, his concept of hybridity attempts to return it to the colonized" (27). It

questions dogmatic and moralistic positions in connection to the meaning of oppression and discrimination. The foundational discourse of hybridity lies in anthropologic and biological discourses of conquest and colonization. It draws on local and transnational identification and it generates historically new mediations. The concept of hybridity implies that the postcolonial effects are no longer the unconscious by products of colonialist constructs. They are creative remaking of the colonial past by the colonized in the service of a postcolonial present or future. Postcolonial effectiveness is returned to the colonized people through hybridity.

Colonizers steer a subversive return to the colonial heart: "Yet while the implications of hybridity for the issues of authorization are ambiguous. Ambivalence describes fluctuating relationship between ministry and mockery, an ambivalence that is fundamentally unsettling to colonial dominance (*Key 13*). This should not establish opportunities for speaking which are outside on unavoidable politics of power" (Jacobs 8). The recovery of the agency of the colonizers is found in colonial discourses. Their responses refer the same trouble that various documented histories of overt resistance of colonialism are displaced by articulations of subversive excess. Rather than anti-colonial discourses and formations, the field of colonial discourses is of major concern.

Ambivalence causes transformation not only in social, cultural or economical status of an individual but also in the first place in one's consciousness. Coetzee and Soyinka thought about the environment suitable for them to define their 'self' or 'self-actualization' made to move from their home. If a person is already considering the idea of moving, he/she will make decision about possible responses. Cultural dualism is the result of interaction between an individual and their environment. They do not deserve the same what he wished for moving by. So, their characters shattered and felt

alienated from their homeland and cultural background. Here, they lack spirit to face possible challenges that would come in the future. Soyinka and Coetzee are honest in their observation of two cultures but their character's quest of identity as well as the divided 'self' does not find any resolution because hybridity for Bhabha is caused by 'cultural cross-over' of various sorts emanating from the encounter between colonizers and the colonized. Citing Bhabha, Ashcroft, et al. defines ambivalence as, "[T]he complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizers and the colonized, where colonized people work in the consent of the colonizers" (*Key* 12). Such mediations are prevailing as they are located outside the official practices of citizenship situated in the interstices of numerous legal and cultural borders, which undercut hegemony.

Soyinka and Coetzee's basic theme is identity crisis and the problems caused by it. Most of his books/writings display the traumas of cultural complexity because it includes a number of characters from two cultural backgrounds, which encounter problems in different times, spaces and cultural backgrounds. In their writings, we find the idea that alienation is the problem of the modern world. This sense of being alienated confuses a person and it unendurably frustrates him. That's why, it has been the project of post-colonial writing to interrogate European discourse and discursive strategies from a privileged position within two worlds to investigate the means by which the West imposed and maintained its codes in the colonial domination to the rest of the world. Post-colonial cultures are inevitably hybridized, involving a dialectical relationship between European ontology and epistemology and the impulse to create or recreate independent local identity.

There is complex networking between migrant diasporas and their home countries. The migrants, because of the impact of globalization, are being actively

involved in various fields in the host countries. Mulder's views migration from a new perspective. According to him: "Individual preferences, resources and constraints influence the extent to which certain events and circumstances in parallel career lead to migration" (qtd.in Ainsaar 72). Hybridity in literature and literary writings suggests the experience of cultural mixing. It is experienced by the writers who have been the victims of such a state of being. According to Bhabha, postcolonial writings are always at crossroads of two or more cultures and traditions. Hybridity is an inbetween space, which lies between past and the present; native language and colonizers' language; native culture and imported culture and so on. In Bhabha's words, it gives rise to "an interstitial future that emerges in between the claims of the past and the needs of the present" (*Location* 219). And, in the context of the post-colonial literature and discourse, it suggests cultural and biological hybridity caused by contact and cross co-habitation between the cultures of the colonized and the colonizers.

Migration is an ongoing process that is essential and defining characteristics of humanity from the day the first humans left East Africa to populate the world. It is either forceful or intentional movement from the place of the origin to the unwanted or strange places. It can both be temporary or permanent. It has become a political issue because it challenges and questions identity of the migrants as language, nation and culture is different in the host country. It is the outcome of such borrowing that is assimilation which is not always motivated by the hegemonic influence rather it may turn otherwise. To quote Fred Dallmayr, "the hegemonic culture holds a power fluctuation for subordinate groups eager to gain social acceptance or recognition and thus to terminate discrimination. Where such acceptance is pursued deliberately and with some promise of success" (17). Thus, cultural difference never becomes a

‘complete’ and ‘univocal’ because it moves in symbolic formation from one enunciator to another leaving it further open to cultural translation.

Coetzee and Soyinka suggest first that the colonialist discourse of ambivalence is conspicuous illustration of its uncertainty. Secondly, it is migration of past ‘savages’ from their peripheral spaces to the homes of their ‘master’. Ambivalence is a term developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite. It is an important feature of colonial discourse that depends on the concept of fluctuation in ideological construction. Said says that cultural with its superior position has the power to authorize, to dominate, to legitimate, denote, interdict and validate (47). Thus, superiority of new culture dominates individuals, as they feel inferior of their culture in the new ones. Nationalism is important since people's identity is directly related to the nation; however, if there is loss of nation, there is loss of individual identity.

Soyinka and Coetzee’s characters also have their goals to achieve their unattainable identity to recover their past. It is not possible to create or recreate national or regional formations entirely independent of their historical implication in the European colonial enterprises. Hence, a person encounters crisis of identity, which is realized when the culture is cut across when it intersects natural frontiers. In such a situation, people disperse distant from their homelands temporarily or forever. When a person feels alienated, she/he remains deeply rooted in his/her psychology and fails to link oneself with the metropolis. Overall, it is general and problematic feeling of loss of original language, land and other cultural belongings to each individual. The history of cultural hybridity and its textual expressions goes back to the era of colonial occupation when the colonizers intruded the militarily weak countries and established

their rule Through hybridity, a postcolonial effectiveness is returned to the colonized, who steer a subversive returns to the colonial heart (Jacobs 28).

Negotiation is a process in which individuals or groups once dissimilar become similar, share same sentiments, values and goals whereas attitudes of many persons are united and developed into a unified group in such a context. It results because of functional relation of diverse cultural elements. Assimilation as Dallmayr quotes Robert Park and Ernest Burgess: "A process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire memories, sentiments and attitudes of other persons and groups by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated by them in a common cultural life" (14). Large numbers of immigrants are steadily socialized or assimilated into the prevailing way of life of the nations like India, Africa, Caribbean Islands and so on with their accent on individual initiative and the profit motive. But the 'melting-pot rhetoric' alone cannot truly depict cultural complexities of these societies, because it is difficult to find a homogeneous cultural coexistence. This crossroad in Bhabha's language is inbetween space which means "neither the one nor the other but something else beside, inbetween" (*Location* 219). Hybrid articulation in postcolonial writing is considered as a source of an artistry, a creative power which is violent binary categories of pure and impure; and the authentic and unauthentic.

Cultural encounter does not always entail merger or fusion but may lead to partial adaptation or negotiation through a process of cultural borrowing. This happens when the respective cultures encounter each other on a more nearly equal or roughly comparable basis. According to Jacobs, "The concept of hybridity implies postcolonial effects that are no longer only unconscious byproducts of colonialist constructs. They are the creative remaking of the colonial past by the colonized in the service of a postcolonial present/future" (28). We can understand the causes that

happen due to migration if we read the ties of several cognitive realms, languages and worldviews in the written text. The western orbit, the most frequently discussed example of cultural assimilation is the United States. In this case, a large numbers of immigrants from many parts of the world are being progressively integrated into dominant social and political fabric. This is true to many postcolonial non-western societies. Like the USA, they too carry the 'melting-pot' rhetoric. The hybrid modality also challenges the assumption of the "[. . .] 'pure' and the 'authentic' concepts upon which the resistance often stands" (*Post Colonial* 9). Rather the notions like 'cultural pluralism' or 'rainbow coalition', culture is sustaining a broader social synthesis.

The series of inclusions and exclusions on which a dominant culture is based, are deconstructed by the very entry of formally excluded subjects into mainstream discourse. The dominant culture is contaminated by the linguistic and racial differences of the native 'self'. Their hybridity is defined in relation to the mixed culture. The distinctive features can be felt only in relation to the divided roots. The identity of the westerner's as a civilized, for example, is distinguishing only in the presence of the non-westerners. The theoretical terms 'self' and 'other' are significant in relation to the post colonial theory. They are the colonial terms used to legitimise the East by the West to guarantee the Euro-centric self. Euro-centric self legitimizes the self and "other". The Other represents the third world which were once colonized by the west and those which have been still colonized. Since the beginning of human civilization, the Europe has put itself in the centre and the rest in the periphery. The term Other is created in relation to the term self. These terms illustrate the power relation between the colonizer and the colonized. It is created just to legitimize the "west" and the "other". Moreover, this research critically analyzes that hybridity

where the split consciousness is divided both at the conscious and unconsciousness levels. Neither the Caribbean nor the European consciousness seems to guide but they moves towards the spaces which incorporate the entities of two different element that are “something beside” the both. The hybrid figured represents Homi K. Bhabha’s concept of “in between space”. According to Bhabha, postcolonial writings are always at the crossroads of two or more culture and tradition. This cross road in Bhabha’s language is “in between space” which means neither the one nor the other but something else beside, in between (*Location* 219).

The characters are always after emotional or spiritual renewal of their 'self'. The contact between native people and the colonizers had multifaceted impact on the land and culture in the colonized country. There in a colonial society, emerged a binary relationship between people of two cultures, races and languages and such relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society. There can be homogeneity of cultures because of the prevalence of different cultural groups. The postcolonial text generally is a hybrid object, a hybridist, which is form giving, lending meaning to the bewildering array of cultural translations. Not only this, the large movement of labors and slaves from Asia and Africa to Europe and the Caribbean region brought together people of different cultures and traditions. All such movements namely migration, exile and supply of indentured labors gave rise to hybrid culture across the colonized world: “Hybridity is the sing of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal” (Bhabha 159).

Soyinka and Cotezee concentrates on the theme that suggests cultural duality, which has alienated from its culture. His feeling about cultural heritage appears ambiguous because he does not stick to either side ignoring the pitfalls of each

culture: “The colonized engage not only in resistance but also in complicity, conciliation, and even blithe disregard. It is a revisionary form of imperialist nostalgia that defines the colonized as always engaged in conscious work against the ‘core’” (15). Although the authority of colonial discourse depends crucially on its location in narcissism and imaginary, the concept of stereotype as suture is recognition of ambivalence of the authority and those orders of identification. The role of discriminatory knowledge that depends on presence of difference is to provide a process of splitting and multiple/contradictory beliefs at the point of enunciation and subjectification. The theory of ambivalence is related to imperial discourse. The borderline, margin and doubtful responses by constituting the center are indeterminately ambivalent. But, the concept of ambivalence is not reversal of binary opposition. The reading of colonial discourse suggests that point of intervention should shift from the identification of images to an understanding of the process of subjectification made possible through stereotypical discourse: “The problem for colonial discourse is that it produces compliant subjects that reproduce its assumptions, habits and values – that is to mimic the colonizers. Instead, it produces ambivalent subjects whose mystery is never very far from mockery” (*Key* 13).

Along with the process of indigenization, they began to manipulate English language to suit their goals. Intercultural engagement is equally prevalent in contemporary societies as it was in the course of the development of human civilization. Though relatively intermittent in the western steeping, examples of cross-cultural dialogue are more numerous in non-western post-colonial societies. The crux of post-colonial debates about cultural authenticity, hybridity and resistance is most prominently drawn from the point of language in the world. Any demand for full representation of cultural difference is bound to lead to loss of meaning as it involves

interdisciplinary and the emergent cultural forms. Such forms can be contextualized in terms of prevailing frame of reference. This is to say that the negotiation groups while acquiring new cultural values or making adjustment with the alien cultural milieu maintain an indigenous solidarity because; “the ‘pure’ and original identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sides of discrimination and domination” (Bhabha 159).

In postcolonial writing, such effects of hybrid articulation have been felt and expressed in diverse ways. By the time, it was important to encourage a situation in which a multiplicity of ‘English’ is able to co-exist as opposed to a world in which one metropolitan English was dominant. English language has attracted support in the postcolonial societies because of its perceived malleability. Far from “enforcing the cultural centrality of its historical homeland, the language has proved to be a generous and accommodative traveler” (Boehmer 210). By adopting local idioms and cultural referents, English in non-western world is acclimatized, made national. This evident is postcolonial narratives. Post-independence societies established new metaphors of nationhood not only to rewrite history, but also to create and frame defining symbols for imagining the nation. Using conceptual structures drawn from local tradition, they made an effort to integrate the cultural life of the past with their post-independence westernized realities. The individual and collective response of the people of hybrid cultures and societies towards their own situation has often taken form of anger and frustration.

Soyinka and Coetzee provide a textual version of his hybrid articulation. To articulate the conflict within his 'self', he evokes characters' ambivalent situations. His hybridity, thus, does not appear alone from the cultural mixture or encounter but it is related to the history of his ancestry at the same time. In his career, he is constantly

haunted by the images of Islamic traditions. His articulation seems to guide his thought towards the spaces that incorporate the entities of two different elements that are something beside the both. Their novel exemplifies consciousness of his hybridity as the 'Third Space', the inbetween space, which governs his writings. The inbetween space provides him several images corresponding to his own hybrid articulation:

"Such images offer away of imposing an imaginary coherence upon the experience of dispersal and fragmentation" (Hall 112). Achebe plays with articulation that represents postcolonial endeavors to heal the cultural wound caused by colonial intervention.

Postcolonial writing accepts the existence of both the cultural patterns of the oppressors and the distinct culture of the oppressed. In-between location is the space that incorporates the complexities of postcolonial realities; "The 'Postcolonialisms' described hereafter are not always neatly 'against' colonialism's residual and revived formations, part of the seductive realm of resistance. I do not deny the possibility of resistance but instead I suggest that it is one articulation of many which work against or slip outside of colonialism" (Jacobs 15). It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but triplicates its identification in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the 'Third space' culture that Bhabha advocates is the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature. This space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but triplicates its identification in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the "Third space" (38). Culture that Bhabha advocates is the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature. This space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures.

The effort of indigenous people's struggle to restore their native culture and language is often studied under postcolonialism. Thus postcolonialism emerged as a device to judge the biased perspective of the Europeans that depicts autonomous identity and colonizers effort to re/define and re/create tradition, culture and language that have been creolized. Postcolonial world is so pathetic that it drains even the last drop of self-respect from the colonized. The continual feeling of being lost and dislocated made once colonized people wander to re/construct their lost identity in the heterogeneous postcolonial world. Their original cultures changed too much and it was difficult to return to the root. Bhabha describes this space as a productive space because it enables to address colonial and postcolonial issue simultaneously,

“It is significant that the productive capacities of this third space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance” (38). So, it is a multicultural and multinational space, which could be called the global culture. This space, which is neither the one nor the other i.e. inbetween provides terrain for postcolonial hybrid writers to define their 'selves'. According to Bhabha, a hybrid articulation is not only mimetic; it is also a state of life and experience and domination begins through disavowal.

The function of ambivalence is one of the most significant discursive and psychical strategies of discriminatory power. Ambivalence suggests that resistance exists in fluctuating relation within the colonial subject that characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject; “For a willingness to descend into the alien territory may reveal that the theoretical recognition of the split space . . . an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of culture, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity” (38). Bhabha's postulation can be argued that discourses on hybridity represent not only the post colonial contest against the notions of fixity like ' standard', ' singular'

and 'pure' but it is also "[. . .] the cultural spaces for opening up new forms of identification" (179). Bhabha describes the inbetween position of hybrid existence as a 'Third Space', which emerges between the traits of two mixed cultures.

The resting place can be the exile for them. One's hybridization of language and culture makes him/her half man/woman and such person always feels lack of place to reside. Likewise, the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification. It vacillates between what is always 'on place' that is already known and something that must be anxiously repeated. It can never be a discourse rather it is the process of ambivalence fluctuating from centre to the stereotype. The colonial settlers after arriving from their own vine to the alien land established new identities since they were displaced from their points of origin. The feature of ambivalence is somehow related to hybridity. Bhabha's argument is that colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalent because it never wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonizers- this would be too threatening (*Key 13*).

It is not necessarily disempowering for the colonial subject but rather empowered, the effect of ambivalence is to produce a profound disturbance of authority of colonial discourse. Their newly emerged identities never give them senses of comfort within, such identities are forever questioned and actual 'crisis' remains at the heart of their doubtful structure. Then, there arises the feeling of alienation, which all the time haunts them with fluctuating identities. Straut Hall opines, "identities are not fixed but subject to continuous 'play' of history, culture and power . . . identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by and we position ourselves with the narratives of the past" (11). Hegemony is important, as the capacity to influence thought of the colonized people is by far the most sustained and potent operation of imperialism in colonized region. Indeed, an empire is distinct from

collection of subject states forcibly controlled by a central power by the virtue of effectiveness of its cultural hegemony. Consent is achieved by the interpellation of the colonized subjects by imperial discourse so that Euro-centric values, assumptions, belief and attitudes could be accepted as most natural or valuable.

It has been the project of post colonial writings to interrogate European discourse and discursive strategies from a privileged position within two worlds to investigate the means by which westerners imposed and maintained its codes in the colonial domination to the rest of the world. The inevitable consequences of such interpellation are that the colonized subject understands itself as marginal to those Euro-centric values accepting their centrality. "Hence hybridity raises the question of the terms of the mixture, the condition of mixing and *mélange*. At the same time, it's important to note the ways in which hegemony is not merely reproduce but refigured in the process of hybridisation". Hegemony is useful for describing success of imperial power over colonized people whose desire for self-determination has been suppressed by hegemonic notion of greater good. However, the issues of social order, stability and advancement are defined by the colonizing power. Ideology is understood in terms of ideas, meanings and practices. The practices that are asserted to be universal truths are maps of meaning which support the power figures of particular groups. Above all, ideology is not separate from particular activities of life but it is a material phenomenon rooted in the day-to-day conditions.

The representation of formal education system as a meritocracy, which offers all an equal chance in a fair society and the representation of people by color as 'nature' inferior and less capable than white people could be described as ideological. Ideologies provide people with rules of practical conduct and moral behavior equivalent to religion is understood in secular sense of unity of faith between

conception of the world and corresponding norms. It connotes rigidity and a changing order and disorder; the relationship between colonized and colonizer is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizers. Hybridity has frequently been used in postcolonial discourse to simply mean the cross-cultural exchange whereas hybridization means the process by which colonized people mime colonizing people's language, western ideas, practices and the rejection of native social-cultural aspects. The ultimate point of choosing one's identity is to give meaning and direction to life. Of course, people after assuming an identity might find it unsatisfactory and they want to take another.

Culture is caught up and it functions as a part of cultural technologies that organize and shape social life and human conduct. A cultural technology is a part of 'machinery' of institutional and organizational structures that produce particular configuration of knowledge and power. Culture is a matter not just of representations and consciousness but also of institutional practices, administrative routines and spatial arrangements. Though hegemony in such a situation prevails for social control during relative stability, it takes a back seat to unifying role of ideology. It is power that gives a person an identity to control or delimit one's life. Hegemony involves education and winning of consent of colonized rather than the use of brutal force and coercion. Hegemony implies a situation where a 'historic bloc' of ruling class faction exercises social authority and leadership over the subordinate class through combination of force and more importantly consents. Hegemony involves those processes of meaning making by which a dominant authoritative set of representations and practices emerged and maintained. A cultural social unity is achieved through which multiplicity of dispersed skills with heterogeneous aims were welded together with a single aim as the basis of an equal and common conception of the world. The

building, maintenance or subversion of a common conception of the world is an aspect of ideological struggle involving a transformation of understanding through criticism of the existing popular ideologies.

The colonized people, rather than their agency, are produced by the agonistic ambivalence of colonialism itself. The colonized subjects take up the spirits of the colonizers as equivocal circulation of colonial constructs. Ambivalence is the process of mimicry, which reveals the limitation in the authority of colonial discourse, almost as though colonial authority inevitably embodies the seeds of its destruction: "In so far as Bhabha's understanding of the ambivalence of colonialism dislodges the surety of colonial power, his analytic perspective is post colonialist yet. Bhabha's postcolonial analysis has not gone uncivilized" (Jacobs 27). The relation of culture and power, which most typically characterizes modern societies should be best understood in the light of the respects in which the field of culture is increasingly governed, organized and constructed.

The mimetic performance of the colonized subject subverts colonialism not because it might be a conscious act of misappropriation, but because it has a menacing effect, which is produced by colonialism's paranoia. Ambivalence is the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterize the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. Ambivalence, as the sign of cultural/ historical difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of repetition. Thus, ambivalence also stands for the strength and rigidity of white mechanism that refers to the destructive characteristics of colonial agents. The people who follow the culture of the others are caught up in the state of double articulation of their identity. Mimicry is, then, the sign of a double articulation, a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which appropriates the others as it visualizes power: "Mimicry is also the

sign of the inappropriate; however, a difference or recalcitrance, which cohere the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance and poses an immanent threat to both normalized knowledge and disciplinary powers” (Bhabha 78). Cultural dualism is the result of the colonial project of the west. The term has something to do with the traumatic colonial experience, since it is the ‘ambivalent relationship’ of the colonizer and the colonized.

The argument mentioned above can be regarded as an apt example of resistance against colonialism because the chased converts are the products of colonialism. An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependent on the concept of fixity as the sign of cultural, historical and racial differences in the discourse of colonialism, which is a paradoxical mode of representation. It connotes rigidity and unchanging order as well as disorder, decadence and daemonic repetition. The threat inherent in mimicry comes not from an overt resistance but from the way in which it continually suggests an identity not quite like that, the colonizers are always potentially and strategically insurgents.

It further appears as fragmented meanings of common sense inherent in a variety of representations. Ideological hegemony is the process by which certain ways of understanding the world becomes self-evident or naturalized to render alternatives. Ambivalence, therefore, gives rise to a control version of proposition. The colonial relationship is always ambivalent because it generates seeds of its own destruction. This assumption is controversial because it implies that the colonial relation is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion in the past of the colonized. The concept of globalization and hybridity are more adequate than that of culture imperialism. However, they suggest a less coherent, unified and directed process. This should not lead to abandon the exploration of power and inequality. The fact is that

power is diffused or commodities are subversively used to produce new hybrid identities: Relation of power and hegemony are inscribed and reproduced within hybridity for whatever we look closely enough we find the traces of asymmetry in culture, place and descent. People are reflected upon the world where they, through the common sense of popular culture, organize their lives and experiences. Thus, common sense becomes crucial point of ideological conflict. Common sense, in particular, is a struggle to forget 'good sense', which is the recognition of class character of capitalism. Ideology is a body of systematic ideas whose role is to organize and tie a bloc of diverse social structures.

Despite the prevalence of ambivalence, the colonized people cope with new values established by the colonizers. The ambivalence of the postcolonial subject is always potentially destabilizing colonial discourse. It locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance of the colonial space. Conflict is the chief trademarks of human relations through which communication or dialogue between cultures is possible. It is dialogue of cultures that characterizes our age, which is incarnated by ethnology. When two diverse cultures encounter in the process of acculturation, there emerges an initial stance of conflict. Conflict occupies a prominent place in the annals of human history as a mode of social and cultural interactions.

The conflicts representation of the African culture and European tradition is the central focus of the study. The characters articulation embodies cultural dualism due to their own divided roots which neither can assimilate to both cultures at the same time nor can ignore both or take one and shun the other. Postcolonialism not only opens up a new political front within discourse and representation but also criticizes the notion of the unified identity that rejects the concept of grand narrative regarding cultural boundary and breaks the hierarchy regarding cultures. Hybridity of

the characters bears the traces of divided roots mixed blood and cultural dualism caused by cultural encounter during colonial occupation. Bhabha says about the identities in between cultural differences and hybridity as, “Such fantastic remaining of the subjects of cultural differences do not derive their discursive authority from anterior causes be it human nature or historical necessity- which, in a secondary more, articulate essential and expressive identities between cultural difference in the contemporary world” (219).

The ambivalence experiences are the cause of hybrid articulation. Such expressions steam from the realization of the lack of cultural roots, identity and the in-between spaces that provide the location for resistance as well as the desire in poet to articulate his mixed cultural heritage. Hence, postcolonialism becomes the problem of fixed narratives regarding culture rather than as part of the solution. The colonial settlers once they arrived in strange land felt the necessity of establishing new identity since they were displaced from their own point of origin. In a colonized society, there emerged a binary relationship between the peoples of two cultures, races and language and such relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society: “Hybrid hyphenations emphasize the incommensurable elements – the stubborn chunk-as the basis of cultural identification” (219). The equally worth noticing aspect of writing is tactfulness to make a correspondence between the change of style and theme. The deviation and distortion on materiality and choice of diction go parallel with the deviation in perception of reality caused by increasing awareness of cultural complexity.

Both texts provides a textual version of the poet's hybrid articulation. To articulate the conflict within self, the characters evoke ambivalence situations and hybridity, thus, dose not come alone from the cultural mixture or encounter but it is related to the history of his ancestry at the same time.

III. Colonized Psychosis in an Ambivalence Situation in Coetzee's *Youth* and Soyinka's *The Lion and the Jewel*

This research analyzes that how the western ideology constructs the identity of the non-western people because the social construction of identity always takes place in a context marked by power relationships. The construction of identities uses building materials from history, geography, institution, power apparatuses and religious revelations of particular society. All these social materials rearrange the meaning according to social determinations and cultural projects that are rooted in the social structure and in the space-time framework. In this way, the identity of the person is historically and culturally constructed from the particular society. So, a western ideology cannot legitimize the identity of the African people.

Coetzee's *Youth* has been described as a pivotal work in the development of his oeuvre that takes place at a frontier outpost somewhere within the teaches of empire, recognized as a universalized understanding of South Africa's colonial history. This novel represents the historical document of Africa. Homi K. Bhabha views that Coetzee's writing are the "documents of a society divided by the effects of apartheid that enjoin the international intellectual community to meditate on the unequal . . ." (*Location of Culture* 5). Moreover, *Youth* exercises the colonial discourses that construct the inferiority of the native people. The duty of the colonizers' ideology is to find out other in the colonized and legitimize them as inferior or other:

He visits the offices of the London Country Council and enters his name on a list of relief teachers, teachers ready to fill vacancies at short notice. He is sent for an interview to a secondary modern school in Barnet at the far end of the Northern Line. His degree is in

mathematics and English. The headmaster wants him to teach social studies; in addition, to supervise swimming two afternoons a week.

(42)

Like the colonizer, John is violent towards the natives' people for constructing the enemy because he represents the ambivalence status of the postcolonial human beings. The colonizers like John cannot possess the key to decode the African native people's language and culture. He also cannot report to differentiate between the colonizers language and the conversation of the native people.

John's colonial mentality, in fact, focuses on the dichotomy relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. The colonized are always shown as inferior, uncivilized and in need of leadership, incapable of self-governance and in managing their resources. The western critics, philosophers and scientists are always at the apex of everything, and source of every significant activity: "The French are the most civilized people in the world. All the writers are steeped in French culture; most regard France as their spiritual home France and, to an extent, Italy, though Italy seems to have fallen a hard time" (75).

The colonial mentality creates gulf between the orient and the west and between his dreams land of London actually is and that is represented in his mind. He further misrepresents about his native land and can't able to find about the gap between what he reads in books about London and what he actually finds about it. The colonial mentality represents the European language, literature and cultures are superior to the "others". The non west things are rejected to give any significant role. If any role is given, that is always a negative impact for colonial mentality. As Ashcroft Griffiths and Tiffin has defined ambivalence along with Bhabha's lines as:

It describes the complex mix of attraction and reputation that characterizes the relationship between colonizers and colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simple and completely opposed to the colonizer. (12)

Colonial mentality represents the orient as the liar, suspicious lethargic. It views that white race is presented as clear, direct, noble, mature, rational, virtuous. This mentality always represents oriental people as unruly inscrutable or malign.

The political purpose of representation is to expose the falsity of this mode of presenting the colonial subject as another to the self of dominant colonial culture.

Likewise, Edward Said's *Orientalism* argues that representation is a discourse formed by west about the non-west. It is a created and made by the West to govern the East.

Representation is the western experience of east or western thought about the orient.

In this regard, representation is the style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction made between the orient and the occident. Post-colonial criticisms attempt to reexamine the colonial relationship and colonial perspective employed in discourse of cultural representation and the text dealing with colonial relation:

Lakunle. A savage custom, barbaric, out-dated,

Rejected, denounced, accursed,

Excommunicated, archaic, degrading,

Humiliating, unspeakable, redundant.

Retrogressive, remarkable, unpalatable. (8)

The western imperialism is able to promote its own interest in the protagonist,

Lakunle. Colonized people accept that the interest of the colonizers is the common interests and they have to adopt it. Being victimized by colonial mentality, the

protagonist accepts western imperialism and hegemony that compels him to experience the marginal life which is the binary opposition of various kind of dominant discourse created by Europe.

This novel addresses unprecedented imperialism attraction in Coetzee's attentions. The emphasis of much of this text is decidedly cultural; emerging as it does from literary studies, but its effects has reached into a wide range of disciplinary fields. Coetzee's text has come to be known as colonial discourse analysis:

The British magazines are dominated by dismayingly modest little poems about everyday thoughts and experience, poems that would not have raised an eyebrow half a century ago. What has happened to the ambition of poets here in Britain? Have they not digested the news that Edward Thomas and his world are gone for ever? Have they not learned the lesson of Pound and Eliot, to say nothing of Baudelaire and Rimbaud, he Greek Epigrammatists, the Chinese? (58)

Coetzee analyzes the colonial discourse that shows the ways in which discursive formation work to create a complex field of values, meanings and practices through which the colonizer's Self is positioned as superior and colonized as placed as an inferior. This binary opposition is possible due to the colonial mentality of the colonized people.

This research is useful for analyzing the success of imperial power over a colonized people whose desire for being independent has been suppressed by colonial discourse. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin say that hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interest is the interest of all (116). They further say:

Consent is achieved by the interpellation of the colonized subject by imperial discourse so that Euro- centric values, assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes are accepted as a matter of course as the most natural or valuable. The inevitable consequence of such interpellation is that the colonized subject understands itself as peripheral to those Euro- centric values, while at the same time accepting their centrality. (117)

The protagonist, Lakunke finds his life, culture, religion, custom; and technology in Africa is inferior because his thought is influenced by the colonizer's discourse. This play presents that colonized people's assumption of their life as a provincial because of the cultural and political hegemony of western imperialism:

No Sidi! [Very tenderly.]

When we are wed, you shall not walk or sit tethered,

as it were, to my dirtied heels

Together we shall sit at table

-Not on the floor- and eat,

Not with fingers, but with knives

And forks, and breakable plates

Like civilized beings. (9)

This play represents the western mission of civilizing to third world countries. The westernized character internalizes the western cultural assumptions and left his native tradition. This play analyzes the effects of colonial domination on the psyche of the colonized people and his social and economic control. It also shows that the colonial mentality of the protagonist cannot defense the nature and impact of inherited power relations between the colonizer and the colonized:

It's so unclean. And then,
 The sound you make- 'Pyout'!
 Are you being rude to me?
 Lakunle [wearily]. It's never any use.
 Bush girl you are, bush girl you'll always be:
 Uncivilized and primitive- bush girl
 I kissed you as all educated men-
 And Christians-kiss their wives.
 It is the way of civilized romance. (9)

The colonial mentality accepts the colonized people as an inferior and it believes the colonizer's discourse that the colonized or non-western people are irrational, barbaric, emotive and primitive. The colonial discourse is not only able to rule the colonized people but also able to contain the possibility of resistance from them.

John and Lakunle's colonial mentality cannot allow him to be aware about his own identity culture and existence and can't distinguish between his dreamland of Europe and the real one. Similarly, they try to imitate the life style of western philosopher, "for the rest he buys bread at the corner shop. It is a diet Rousseau would approve of, or Plato" (*Youth* 2-3). He eagers to copy western life style and has always thought himself clever but discovers that is not enough to present misery or even assure his existence. Unsocial, aware that he does not make a good initial impression, lacking money and contacts, he leads a Spartan life subsisting on bread and cheese and an occasional apple, paying rent for a dilapidated room; he nevertheless manages to get several jobs. He accepts a job that requires him to teach social studies and swimming. His degrees are in mathematics and English. He curses himself for accepting it: "He does know English well enough to do English in prose. He is not

even sure he can do the parts of London ... He has not mastered London. If there is any mastering going on, it is London mastering him” (63). John speaks through and by virtue of the European imagination that is dominated by colonial mentality. The colonial mentality, not only suppresses his attitudes but it also kills the possibility of resistance to it from the westerners.

Legitimizing other and practices are at the very heart of uneven material and political terrains of imperial worlds as the work shown the nexus of colonial discourse and ideology within the imperial process has been explained, so many of the conceptual binaries that were illustrated as fundamental to its structure of power have been problematic. Binary oppositions like core/periphery, inside/outside and self/other have given way for legitimizing the identity of powerless people: “In his English courses he did not at the beginning farewell. His tutor in literature was a young Welshman named Mr Jones. Mr Jones was new to South Africa; this was his first proper job. The law students, enrolled only because English, like Latin, was a required subject” (26).

Being affected by this mentality, John and Lakunke break ties with home and country, struggles to establish an identity, and give up as a poet but not as a writer. It is an awkward if not entirely miserable age for him. Introverted, feeling keenly his isolation from home and country, he arrives in London not only as a foreigner from south Africa but as an artist to be. The young man was free to starve, even die contoured by anybody except his mother. Colonial ideology is inherent in a discourse that defines the identity of non- western people in relation to the westerners. In this way, the colonial discourse has deliberately produced the Other in order to create its identity and to impose the colonial power over the Other. In *The World the Text and the Critic*, Said argues that the western discourse legitimizes non- European culture as

an inferior (47). The relationship between the West and the East is depended on the colonial discourse, which enveloped the western power.

Youth locates itself strategically within that portentous moment of suspension when an increasing defensive imperialism begins making plans for a final reckoning with its others. According to Ashcroft et al:

[...] allegory is employed to expose the ways in which the allegorical form is used in the colonizing process. Thus in the Coetzee text, for example the life of a magistrate isolated on the boundaries of an unnamed empire, and his peaceful relations with the people] beyond the boundary, is disrupted when they are re-classified as barbarians' by the visit time the full truth about the society in which he lives.

Although such texts do not deal directly with specific colonial situations, they present a powerful allegory of underlying colonial ideology. (10)

Social, cultural and political history is allegorically enveloped in this novel. The colonial history fictionalized the narrative of empire itself and legitimizes the Other. Gilbert Yeoh says: " Coetzee's view of writing as failure in truth telling and a deception dominates and shapes his fiction and is implicit in works like [. . .]. His ultimate emphasis is not epistemological but ethical unreliability" (334).

In *Youth*, John has one piece of black suit, which he wears in an interview at IBM. He gives an IQ test. He has always done better at test than at real life. He accepts a position as a trainee programmer with a beginning salary of seven hundred pounds per annum. He is good at mathematics but knows nothing about computers. He finds the course of struggle and suffers and the instructor's displeasure. He passes without distinction and is assigned an office: "He has attacks of panic, which he beats

off with difficulty. In the office there is nothing to rest the eye on but flat metallic surfaces. Under the shadowless glare of the neon lighting, he feels his very soul to be under attack.”(47). Nevertheless he achieves his first goal and should be happy. But not because he finds that IBM is "turning him into a zombie" (47). He escapes into the world of dreams: films by antiunion. He fantasizes about Monica Vitti, imagining him as her single solace and comfort.

Lakunle , the protagonist, represents his native people, family and people as exotic, terrifying, barbaric, uncivilized and superstitious. To justify his colonial mentality, he leaves his native traditions and moves to western tradition for his bright future. The European ideology plays important role for him because he represents that everything related to white or European is superior, adventurous and courageous. This mentality has suggested that there is no narrative interest without European involvement and intervention:

Lakunle[as the last of the procession disappears,
shakes his fist at them, stamping in the ground].
Voluptuous beast! He loves his life too well
To bear to part from it. And motor roads
And railways would do just that, forcing
Civilization at his door. He foresaw it
And he barred the gates, securing fast
His dogs and horses, his wives and all his
Concubines ... ah, yes ... all those concubines. (24)

The identity as human beings is only fertile in western land because Lakunle thinks that his individual identity as human beings is only fertile in western technology. He believes that his native people lack rationality.

Lakunle breaks his ties with home and country, struggled to establish an identity as a westerner. His chaotic mind is affected by the colonial mentality because he is a colonized who never wants himself to be independent. He always waits to be imposed by the authority of west.

Lakunle: [as they drag him towards the platform].

No, no. I won't. This foolery bores me.

It is a game of idiots. I have work of more importance.

Sidi [blending down over Lakunle who has been seated forcibly on the platform].

You are dressed like him

You look like him

You speak his tongue

You think like him

You're just as clumsy

In your Lagos ways-

You'll do for him! (14)

His wants to be independent, but his colonial mentality doesn't allows him to be free from the colonial psychosis. He thinks that west is the source of everything and he compares his life style in relation to the west. He acknowledges as if the non-western world's regions as Said puts in *Culture and Imperialism*, have no life, history, culture and desire to be independence (XIX). He always ignores the fact that his native worlds also have their own histories, lives and cultures with integrities equally worth representing as the western one. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said views that native people's desire to be independence is based on the independence of us (XVIII).

Lakunkle's colonial mentality, in fact, focuses on the dichotomy relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. The colonized are always shown as inferior, barbaric, uncivilized and in need of leadership, incapable of self-governance and in managing their resources. The western critics, philosophers and scientists are always at the apex of everything, and source of every significant activities. The colonial mentality represents the European cultures are superior to the "others". The non-west things are rejected to give any significant role. If any role is given, that is always a negative impact for colonial mentality. As Ashcroft Griffiths and Tiffin define ambivalence along with Bhabha's lines as:

It describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizers and colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simple and completely opposed to the colonizer. (*Post-Colonial Studies reader* 12)

Colonial mentality represents the orient as the liar, suspicious lethargic. It views that white race is presented as clear, direct, noble, mature, rational, virtuous. This mentality always represents oriental people as unruly inscrutable or malign.

Oriented is not what it is but it is orientalized by the colonial mentality. Being affected by this mentality, Lakunkle breaks his ties with home and country, struggles to establish an identity that creates gulf between the orient and the west and between his dreams of west and his reality. He further misrepresents about his natives and can't able to find about the gap between what he adopts and what he actually find about it. For Eurocentric self, the colonial mentality is necessary in the formidable identity constitution of their oppression. In this novel, Coetzee suspends and interrupts the teleology of the colonial state. He reminds us that the images the state produce of its

enemies are wholly contingent on, yet necessary for, the self-realized needs of colonial expansion and hegemony. When we relate this novel in South African context, we can observe the writer's intentions that are undoubtedly to inflect his narrative with the suggestion that all imperialist efforts might be similarly arranged.

Furthermore, Coetzee deconstructs this colonial history, much as an ethnographer or archeologist might peel back the recursive identity construction of "self" and "other" in situated contexts. Many critics, reviewers, scholars and novelists have analyzed this novel from different perspectives like ethical, historicist, psychoanalytical, allegorical, narratological and linguistic perspectives. John is attempted to secure imperial dignity that is one of the feature of irony because the more he tries to legitimize the inferiority of native people, the more he evokes his painful state.

Lakunkle's colonial mentality cannot allow him to be aware about his own identity culture and existence; as a result, he can't distinguish between his dreams of Europe from the real one. Colonial mentality represents the unconscious bias clarified by Edward Said in *Orientation* as:

The value efficacy, strength, apparent variety of a written statement about the orient therefore relies very little, and cannot instruct mentally depend, on oriented as such on the contrary, the written statement is a presence to the reader by virtue of the having excluded, displaced mode supererogatory any such real thing as "the orient". Thus all of orientation stands forth and among from the orient that orientation makes sense at all depends more on the west than on orient. (21)

Said presents canonical view of *Orientalism* that is supposed to have been existed even in the time of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Dryden, Pope and Byron. Colonial

mentality has certain stereotypes to represent land, people culture and politics of non-western world.

Said's *Orientalism* presents how the western image produces myths about the laziness, decent and irrationality of the orient. Similarly, Lakunkle tries to imitate the life style of westerners. He is eager to copy western life style and has always thought himself clever, but discovers that is not enough to present misery or even assure his existence as Sadi says; "Come on, school teacher. They'll expect it of you... The man of learning . . . the young sprig of foreign wisdom . . . You must not demean yourself in their eyes . . . you must give them money to perform for your lordship . . ." (51). Unsocial, aware that he does not make a good initial impression; he nevertheless manages to get several jobs.

Lakunkle speaks through and by virtue of the European imagination that is dominated by colonial mentality. The value imposed upon the world by the west; so for a couple of centuries it remained the baseline of the world vision. It became the all-powerful taken-for-granted fact of the era. Ideology is like a discourse that attempts to represent the orient from western perspectives. Through it, westerners always create the hierarchy of superior and inferior and the creator and the created. Jeremy Hawthorn says that "ideology is a near neighbor to discourses in both Foucault's and Bhabha's understandings of the terms" (90). The colonial mentality, not only suppresses his attitudes but it also kills the possibility of resistance to it from the westerners:

Lakunkle: Did you not know it? Well sit down and listen.

My father told me, before he died. And few men

Know of this trick-oh he's a die-hard rogue

Sworn against our progress . . . yes . . . it was . . . somewhere here

The track should have been laid just along

The outskirts. (23)

The representation of "other" is needed for colonial mentality. We may thus, say that 'the other' in order to represent its identity and, then, consolidate colonial power over the other. In *The World, the Text and the Critic*, Said argues; "the method and discourse of western scholarship confine non-European cultures to a position of subordination. Oriental texts come to inhabit a realm without development to be position of colony for European texts and culture" (47).

Likewise, Lakunle is overjoyed when he is accepted as specialists. In this way his colonial mentality thinks that needs European technology for being a great person. Lakunle's colonial mentality always in the process of creating conflict in relation between colonizer and the colonized which represents the problems of establishing intimate and meaningful relationships between two social and cultural groups. For constructing the Eurocentric self, the colonizers have to misinterpret their history of Africa, their religions and culture. Through the discursive strategies, the western hegemony constructs 'Other' as speechless, voiceless, because the colonizers speak of themselves instead of speaking to the other in the process of interpreting the native people's behaviors and culture. The mission of the colonial discourse is to legitimize the other as inferior. It defines them through such a colonial dynamic, simultaneously existing as perpetrators and legatees of historical disenfranchisement and the politics of forgetting. What this research attempts here is not just an accurate definition, but also a way of doing justice to the application of representation in a cultural context. Many researchers simply consider the politics associated with the very concept of representation, different circumstances. Not only economic, geographic, religious and

political factors are the colonialist's concern, even literature rewritten in the period is equally involved.

The language, culture, education, literature, etc., of the colonized people are affected as per the imperialist code of conduct. The burning example can be taken from the South African countries (Nigeria, Cameroon) and South Asian countries (esp., India) with reference to colonial heritage and its aftermath. The protagonist Lakunle projects the image of Africa as the other world like the colonial writers Joseph Conrad who is branded as 'though racist' by Chinua Achebe and he has made a severe critique of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* in his paper entitled "An image of Africa Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*" as:

Heart of Darkness projects the image of Africa as "The other world" the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by opens on the River Thames but the actual story will take place on the River Congo, the Very antithesis of Thames. The River Congo quite decidedly no river and enjoys no old-age pension. ("The Story" 1373)

Conrad also victimized by colonial mentality because he not only dichotomizes and uncivilized; but also implicates that Thomas has overcome its darkness and bestiality, whereas Congo is still in darkness and bestiality and it needs guidance, help and light from European rational civilization to rescue its people from the barbaric situations.

Lakunle cannot define himself, he decides it must be a European phenomenon. Lakunle is disappointed and anguished, of course, but his anguish has lost its freshness and become something like a chronic headache. Colonial discourse is important because it has capacity to influence the thought of the colonized is by far the most sustained and potent operation of imperial power in colonized regions. The

editors of *Key Concept of Post-colonial studies* view about literary hegemony that "the power of English literature as a vehicle for imperial authority" (117). They further quote the view of Gauri Viswanathan as:

The strategy of locating authority in these texts all but affected the sordid history of colonialist expropriation, material exploitation, and less and race oppression behind European world dominance . . . the English literary text functioned as a surrogate Englishman in his highest and most perfect state. (117)

Meanwhile Lakunle's education continues his colonial mentality that compels him to believe the Eurocentric values assumptions, beliefs, attitudes and western writers as superior. Arguing this issue, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin in *Key Concept of Postcolonial studies* say that the colonized subject understands itself as peripheral to those euro-centric values (117). Lakunle always like to talk about western traditions because he thinks that western traditions are only the source of imagination and feelings and evoke life experience.

The protagonist marginalizes his culture and religions in comparison to westerns. Due to his colonial psychosis, the European religions like Christianity is center and the native are shown to be longing to equalize with those European religions. Thus, Lakunle is endowed with the hegemonies feeling or the feelings of inferiority. He always represents the natives as superstitious, powerless, uncivilized and desiring to acquire the so-called civilized religions. As a result, Lakunle is victimized by the Eurocentric beliefs of the western that present themselves as superior and the natives as the inferior. It is the Eurocentric self that centers towards the colonizer's mission to prolong it to fulfill their desire. They wish to define themselves as superior and civilized by calling the colonized as inferior and barbaric.

The process of defining the Othering is the colonizers as well as the colonized mentality that is victimized by the Eurocentric power and ideology. Ironically, barbarism is within the colonizers themselves and they impose their barbarism to the native people. In this way, the binary opposition between civilization and barbarism has no valid definition. As a result, the so-called legitimization of 'Self' (civilization) versus 'Other' (barbarians) is futile.

Likewise, John and Lakunle are overjoyed when they are accepted as junior officers at an experimental agricultural station; then they are informed they cannot commute from the city. John will have to live near the station. How would he live the life of a poet, meet other artists, and have love affairs way out in the country? He has not come to London to analyze plant growth. So he declines this job too. In this way his colonial mentality thinks that he has to go to London or Europe for being a great person. Their colonial mentality is always in the process of creating conflict in relation between colonizer and the colonized which represents the problems of establishing intimate and meaningful relationships between two social and cultural groups.

Lakunle legitimizes the native African people as exotic, terrifying, barbaric, and uncivilized. For justifying the barbarism of native people, he misinterprets them. For him, the non-western land is the territory of barbarians. By evoking the Eurocentric self he claims that everything related to Europe is superior, adventurous and non-European as passive, feminine, and barbaric. He thinks that the individual identity as human beings is only meaningful in relation to Europe. He further claims that the native people have no identity, history and culture. Soyinka ironizes on the institutionalized exploitation in the name of civilization. The imperial power and discourse is not mission of constructing the truth and civilization but legitimized the

non-European as inferior. As Ziauddin Sardar has suggested Ashis Nandy claims in the same vein as:

The imperial powers also created a self-image for those who were being husbanded by colonialism. In as much as this self- image is a dualistic opposite, it is and remains in essence a western construction. Colonialism replaced the Eurocentric convention of portraying the other. An incomprehensible barbarian with the pathological stereotype of the strange but predictable oriental. He was now religious but superstitious, clever but devious, chaotically violent but effeminately cowardly. (16)

Soyinka asserts no civilization has a monopoly on goodness and humane values.

Every civilization shares certain basic values and culture that derives from the social context. Thus, certain values and traditions of particular society determine the life style of the people.

Soyinka describes the place at a frontier outpost somewhere within the empire that is recognized as a universalized understanding of Africa's colonial history. This play represents the historical document of Africa. Homi K. Bhabha views; "documents of a society divided by the effects of apartheid that enjoin the international intellectual community to meditate on the unequal" (*Location of Culture* 5). Moreover, this play exercises the colonial discourses that construct the inferiority of the native people. The duty of the colonizers' ideology is to find out other in the colonized and legitimize them as inferior or other.

Like the colonizers in Coetzee's *Youth*, John legitimizes the native African people as exotic, terrifying, barbaric, and uncivilized. For justifying the barbarism of native people, he misinterprets them. For him, the non- western land is the territory of

barbarians. By evoking the Eurocentric self he claims that everything related to Europe is superior, adventurous and non-European as passive, feminine, and barbaric. He thinks that the individual identity as human beings is only meaningful in relation to Europe. He further claims that the native people have no identity, history and culture. Coetzee ironizes on the institutionalized exploitation in the name of civilization. The imperial power and discourse is not mission of constructing the truth and civilization but legitimized the non-European as inferior. Coetzee asserts no civilization has a monopoly on goodness and humane values. Every civilization shares certain basic values and culture that derive from the social context. Thus, certain values and traditions of particular society determine the life style of the people.

Like the colonizer, Lakunle is violent towards the natives' people for constructing the enemy because of his ambivalence status of the postcolonial human beings. The colonizers like Lakunle cannot possess the key to decode the African native people's culture. He also cannot report to differentiate between the colonizers culture and the conversation of the native people. For constructing the Eurocentric self, Lakunle as the colonizer has misinterpreted the history of Africa, their religions and culture. Through the discursive strategies, the western hegemony constructs Other as speechless, voiceless, because the colonizers speak of themselves instead of speaking to the other in the process of interpreting the native people's behaviors and culture. The mission of the colonial discourse is to legitimize the other as inferior. It defines them through such a colonial dynamic, simultaneously existing as perpetrators and legatees of historical disenfranchisement and the politics of forgetting.

The most important function of colonial mentality is to reveal the ways in which the world is decolorized in various manners. Due to the colonial mentality, non-western people are compelled to accept that they are an innate part of their

degenerate or barbarian state. They accept their representation as less human, less civilized, savage and inferior because they have no white skin. Postcolonial criticism licensed with the cultural discourse of suspicious on the part of colonized people; seeks to undermine the imperial subject. The period after the formal end of colonialism is known as 'postcolonial period,' and literature, art, culture, society, theory, criticism that emerged after colonialism is given a new name 'postcolonial' respectively. It has forcefully produced parallel discourses that have questioned and even subverted since long time and protected by stereotypes and myths about the "Other". Regarding this issue Foucault in his book *Discipline and Punish* says that economic and social power aim to strengthen the social forces (207).

Youth begins a story of John, a 19-year –old South African Mathematics graduate, embarks on a journey to find himself. He brokes his ties with home and country, struggles to establish an identity. The cold war is on and social unrest is erupting one of the supposed paradises he imagines as full of poetry and romance. But he reluctantly works for IBM as a computer programmer and finds only bleakness in London, mirroring the destructive confusion inside him:

At eighteen he might have been a poet, now he is not a poet, not a writer, not an artist. He is a computer programmer, a twenty –four – year –old computer programmer in a world in which there are no thirty-year old computer programmers: one turns oneself into something else-some kind of business – or one shoots oneself. (168).

In fact, this bleak atmosphere affects the entire story – Coetzee's terse yet bitter sentences contribute all the more to depressing readers. To counteract his lonely life without love or poetry, John tries his best to have love affairs, but they only result in his awareness that he can't even have a real love life.

For Eurocentric self, the colonial mentality is necessary in the formidable identity constitution of their oppression. Soyinka suspends and interrupts the teleology of the colonial state. He reminds us that the images the state produce of its enemies are wholly contingent on, yet necessary for, the self-realized needs of colonial expansion and hegemony. When we relate this play in African context, we can observe the writer's intentions that are undoubtedly to inflect his narrative with the suggestion that all imperialist efforts might be similarly arranged. Furthermore, Soyinka deconstructs this colonial history, much as an ethnographer or archeologist might peel back the recursive identity construction of "self" and "other" in situated contexts. Many critics, reviewers, scholars and novelists have analyzed this play from different perspectives like ethical, historicist, psychoanalytical, allegorical, narratological and linguistic perspectives. Lakunle is attempted to secure imperial dignity that is one of the feature of irony because the more he tries to legitimize the inferiority of native people, the more he evokes his painful state.

The colonial discourse assigns truth and imposes their ideology on the natives to exercise their power. The truth about other is depended on the self that is the strategy of the westerner's ideology that victimized the protagonist John, "They come from all over the world: as au pairs, as language students, simply as tourists" (72). The western ideology is designed to construct the other by the colonial mentality of the colonizers that evokes the colonial allegory. The allegory of the colonial discourse legitimizes the binary opposition of cannibalism or barbarism and civilization. In ancient period, the people who could not speak Greek language correctly called barbarous and after wards the Greeks legitimized the word to the brutal and cruel mannered.

Soyinka and Coetzee's novels intensify how the African youth attempt to create the marginal position for themselves. They believe that the Europe is a land of charm, attraction and full of opportunities and they marginalize their native land and people. The novel *Youth* is centered on the colonial mentality among the African youth because they try to internalize the white ideologies in the form of politics, identity, culture, language and literary traditions. They accept the Euro-centric belief of the westerners that white as superior and others as the inferior. John's adolescent's chaotic is affected by the colonial mentality because he is a colonized who never wants himself to be independent. He always waits to be imposed by the authority of west. His understanding wants independent or not is not the concern for him, but his colonial mentality allows him to be independent or not is only concern for him. He thinks that west is the source of everything and he compares his life style in relation to the west. He acknowledges as if the non-western world's regions as Said puts in *Culture and Imperialism*, have no life, history, culture and desire to be independence (XIX). He always ignores the fact that his native worlds also have their own histories, lives and cultures with integrities equally worth representing as the western one. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said views that native people's desire to be independence is based on the independence of us (XVIII).

John and Lakunke represent their native land, family and people as exotic, terrifying, barbaric and uneducated. To justify his colonial mentality, John leaves his native land and moves to London for his bright future. He demonstrates his land as the territory of opportunities. The European ideology plays important role for him because he represents that everything related to white or European is superior, adventurous and courageous. This suggests that there is no narrative interest without European involvement and intervention. The identity as human beings is only fertile

in western land because John thinks that his individual identity as human beings is only fertile in western land. He believes that his native people have lacking individual identity.

The protagonists Lakunle and John misrepresent their own native land and judge their people, culture and literature from the westerners eyes. They are victimized and exploited by the western hegemony. Moreover, this research has analyzed how the characters have expressed their colonial mentality, as the western culture and literary tradition are superior to the non-western. Through the protagonist of *Youth*, we can observe how such colonial discourses encourage the westerners to colonize the African people. Being victimized by colonial mentality, John and Lakunle legitimize native people as uncivilized. For justifying the superiority of the Europeans, they misrepresent his native people as other and explains the non-western land as the territory of uncivilized people. By evoking the Eurocentric self, he claims that everything that relates to Europe is rational and non-Europe is the irrational. He thinks that his future is meaningful only in relation to Europe. The colonizers' construction of self and other is integral to the territorial, military, political and cultural extensions of western power across the globe. Coetzee claims that social construction of other is not mental exercises of the colonizers but also necessary for the Eurocentric self.

The colonized people's identity is not stable because the colonizers legitimize it through their own perspective. Moreover, the identity of origin has not fixed entity but is differential in relation to the western discourse about the other. Lakunle and John are anguished, of course, but their anguish has lost its freshness and become something like a chronic headache. Colonial mentality is important because it has capacity to influence the thought of the colonized is by far the most sustained and potent operation of imperial power in colonized regions.

Meanwhile, John's sexual relation continues with Caroline, a girl he had gone with her in South Africa, turns up in London. She is a drama university student who used to argue the writer of contemporary French dramatists. Her favorite is Beckett; she thinks John too gloomy. Spring has come, and he is full of energy. John is impressed at how soon she has made herself at home in the city. He has left with three other girls and has made contact with several drama agents. The colonial discourse has always dichotomized the non-western world as the world of 'Others' and the western world as the center of everything. The protagonist of *Youth* is searching for a method of communicating his ideas and feeling in western literary tradition. English literature, which is a vehicle for western imperial ideas, kills the native sensibilities of John, the protagonist of *Youth*. In this novel, the English literary tradition functions as a legitimate colonizer in the highest and the most perfect state.

This western literary tradition is, at the same time, the embodiment of universal human value: "In their unique ways, Eliot and Stevens and Kafka suffered no less than Poe or Rimbaud. There is no dishonor in electing to follow Eliot and Stevens and Kafka" (60). John's identity can only become a reality after the legitimization of other because the Eurocentric self is constructed in interaction with others and with the Other: "There is something essential he lacks some definition of feature" (3). Due to the colonial mentality, John, the protagonist violently distorts the pulse of the reality of the natives and rationalizes his mission of finding truth. Stephen Slemon says that Coetzee's writing criticizes the distorted images of the colonized culture (108). After distorting the colonized people's language and culture, John evokes his desire to construct the native people as other or uncivilized.

The colonized subjects have to be legitimized by the colonizer whose duty is to study and research on them. In the process of research on colonized people,

violence and exploitation become the important method to generate the truth. In this way, who are the natives is less important than what the colonizer says about them. Colonial mentality compels the characters that they have to believe the Eurocentric values assumptions, beliefs, attitudes and western writers as superior. Arguing this issue, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin in *Key Concept of Postcolonial studies* say that the colonized subject understands itself as peripheral to those euro-centric values (117). John always like to talk about western writers cultures are western literary traditions because he thinks that western traditions are only the source of imagination and feelings and evoke life experience. John sees the film about Christianity for the experiences as, “It is an unsettling experience. After five years of catholic schooling he had thought he was forever beyond the appeal of the Christian message” (154). The protagonists marginalize their culture and religions to that of westerns. Due to the colonial psychosis, the European religions like Christianity is center and the native are shown to be longing to equalize with those European religions. Thus, they have endowed with the hegemonies feeling or the feelings of inferiority. They always represent the natives as superstitious, powerless, uncivilized and desiring to acquire the so-called civilized religions. As a result, John is victimized by the Eurocentric beliefs of the western that present themselves as superior and the natives as the inferior.

IV. Conclusion

Cultural Dualism and Mimicry in Soyinka's *The Lion and The Jewel* and Coetzee's *Youth*

The protagonists, John and Lakunke evoke their complex mix of attraction and repulsion between colonizers and colonized because they are never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer. Their hybrid consciousness locates them in in-between space; therefore, they have to mimic the colonizers. Their encounter does not always entail merger or fusion, but may lead to partial adaptation or negotiation, through a process of cultural ambivalence. This happens when the two cultures face each other on a more nearly equal or roughly comparable basis. Ambivalence deals with the effects of colonization on cultures and societies. Colonial mentality reveals the repressed desires of the sovereign subject of the colonizer rather than the fixed nature of the natives. In fact, the word "barbarian" becomes a constructed concept imposing to the native people. Colonizer's discourse is an enormously problematic category that is by definition historically and unspecific. Coetzee researches for the alternative locations for observing the non-western culture without simply distorting the image or substituting a real image of the native people and tries to give true voice that gives colonized people its ontological consistency and its fundamental structure. Being legitimized by colonial mentality, John misinterprets the colonized for imposing the definition of inferiority to defend their own civilization. It is the Eurocentric self that centers towards the colonizer's mission to prolong it to meet their desire. They wish to define themselves as superior and civilized by calling the colonized as inferior and barbaric. The process of defining the Othering is the colonizers as well as the colonized mentality that is victimized by the Eurocentric power and ideology.

This research is a critically discussion of cultural dualism in Soyinka and Coetzee's plays that explore the characters' tension between native consciousness and Christianity in the light of how they are located in the in-between location. The conflicts representation of the native culture and Christian tradition is the central focus of the study. Their cultural dualism neither can assimilate to both cultures at the same time nor can they ignore both or take one and shun the other because they do not know whether he is right or not for being Christian that represents Bhabha's concept of inbetween space. A westernized character thinks that western technology and culture are superior to the native so that they have the authority over the native. Hence, European colonial rule, discourse and power are imposed to the native people. According to Bhabha, postcolonial people are always at the crossroads of two or more culture and tradition.

Similarly, *The Lion and the Jewel* examines the exploration of inbetween space and ambivalence conditions of the native people. The deep studies of Soyinka's plays are able to analyze the political, social and economic effects of colonialism to the non- European countries. Through the colonial discourse, the colonial power gradually built up administrative systems based on European systems of government. Gradually, many colonial people were influenced by European ideas. Colonialism has changed the way of life of colonized people. Third World people have to live in European and they have learnt new skill and crafts. They have received education built by the colonial powers and they internalized the European ideas and thought. But they are unhappy because they are suppressed by the colonizer's attitudes. With these words, they initiate the discussion of the cultural ambivalence in his novel. The contact between aboriginals of the colonized and the colonizers had multifaceted impact on the land and culture of the native people.

This cross road in Bhabha's language is in between space which means neither the one nor the other but something else beside, inbetween. Soyinka and Coetzee advocate the postcolonial culture that is of hybridized nature and this space is the space of negation and interaction between cultures. Most of the problems that John and Lakunke encounter are the result of the postcolonial condition of the ambivalence. In terms of cultural identity there is nothing absolutely new in the world. Both texts celebrate hybridity, impurity, intermingling, transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings cultures, ideas, and politics. This is their definition of hybrid; one they embrace in his novels. The texts effectively distribute the narrative voice and elements among several secondary characters that usurp the main story line and provide different reading and interpretations of the events. *The Lion and the Jewel* is the exercise in European postmodernity by a hybrid metropolitan intellectual who fail to show how deeply rooted it is in cultural and religious traditions. They have generated a huge amount of criticism that debates and explores the relationships between Christianity and Yoruba tradition. That is to say, competing definitions of the literary generated by this publications have also depended upon, and predicated, competing definitions of the real. Another reading of the incident would see it as a more straightforward fantastic strategy employed as a metaphor of the postcolonial condition.

Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Conrads Heart of Darkness." *The Story and Its Writer: An Introduction to Short Fiction*. Ed. Annochzer. 4th ed. Vol.2. Boston: Bedford, 1995.1373-1378.
- Ainsaar, Mare. *Reasons for Move: A Study on Trends and Reasons of Internal Migration with Particular Interest in Estonian*. Finland: Turtu University Press, 2004.
- Ashcroft, B., eds. *The Post- Colonial Studies: Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- - - . *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Bhabha, Homi K. " Postcolonial Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Gills Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992.
- - - . *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.
- Carroll, David. *Chinua Achebe: Novelist, Poet and Critic*. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1990.
- Castells, Manuel. *Communal Heavens: Identity and Meaning in the Network Society*. Pricenton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Coetzee, J.M. *Youth*. London: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Dallmayr, Fred. *Beyond Orientalism: Essays on Cross-cultural Enounter*. New Delhi: Rawat Publication, 2001.
- Fanon, Frantz. "The Negro and Language" Trans. Charles Lamb Markmann. *Black Skin White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967. 17-40.
- Foucault, Michael. "Panopticism." Trans. Alan Sheridan. *Discipline and punishment*. New York: Vintage, 1977.

Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 1998.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." Mongia, 110-121.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Oxford UP, 2000.

Jacobs A. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonial and the City*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Jacobus, Lee A., ed. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1993.

Lenta Margaret. "Antobiography: J.M. Coetzee's *Boyhood* and *Youth*." *English in Africa* 30 (May 2003): 157-69.

Lentricchia, Frank and Thomas Mclaughlin, eds. *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Leusman, Harald. "Coetzee: Culture Critique." *American Anthropologist* 20 (Sep 2004): 60-64.

Meskill, Lynn and Lindsay Weiss. "Coetzee on South Africa's Past." *American Anthropologist* 108 (Mar 2006): 88-100.

Mongia, Padmini. Ed. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Oxford India Paperbacks, 2000.

Oehadike, Don C. "Introduction: Igbo Culture and History." *Things Fall Apart*. Oxford: Heinemann, 2000. xix-xlix.

Parry, Benita. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *The Postcolonial Studies: Reader*. Eds. Ashcroft et al. London: Routledge, 1995. 36-44.

Pratt, Mary Louse. "Introduction." *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transcultation*. London: Rutledge, 1992.

- Radhakrishnan, Rajagopalan. *Diasporic Mediations*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Rajan, Sundar Rajeshwari. "Representating Sati Continuities and Discontinuities." *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castel. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001. 167-189.
- Said, Edward. "Crisis in Orientals." *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge. London: Vintage, 1991.
- . *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1993.
- . *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- . *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. "Introduction: A, B, C, D (and E) of Ashis Nandy." *Return from Exile: Alternative Sciences Illegitimacy of Nationalism, The Savage Mind*. Ed. Nandy Ashis. New York: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Selden, Ramen and Peter Widdowson. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York: Harvester Wheat Sheaf, 1993.
- Slemon, Stephen. "Post-colonial Critical Theories." *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castle. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Stoler, Ann and Frederick Cooper, eds. *Tensions of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Soyinka, Wole. *Collected Plays*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974.
- . *Myth, Literature And The African World*. CUP, 1999.
- Yeoh, Gilbert. J.M. Coetzee and Samuel Beckett: Ethics, Truth Telling and Self Deception." *Critique* 44.4 (2003): 31-42.